Remarks

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, 21-25, 27-30 and 32-40 have been canceled above, and new claims 41-55 have been added.

New claim 41 recites a method of compiling to process a call from a calling program to a called program. At compile time, a register length of the calling program is compared to a register length of the called program.

If the register length of the calling program is greater than the register length of the called program, at compile time, a first linkage service program is selected. The first linkage service program assigns a first location to store a least significant portion of an entirety of register contents associated with the call and a second location to store a most significant portion of the entirety of register contents, saves the least significant portion at the first location and the most significant portion at the second location, passes to the called program an identity of the first location such that the called program will access and process the least significant portion but not the most significant portion, and invokes the called program. Also, at compile time, executable code is generated to invoke the first linkage service program.

If the register length of the calling program is less than the register length of the called program, at compile time, a second linkage service program is selected. The second linkage service program assigns a third location to store the entirety of register contents, saves the entirety of register contents at the third location, passes to the called program an identity of the third location such that the called program will access and process the entirety of register contents, and invokes the called program. Also, at compile time, executable code is generated to invoke the second linkage service program.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, 21-25, 27-30 and 32-40 under 35 USC 101 stating that they "do not produce a useful, concrete and tangible result and therefore do not provide a practical application". As noted above, these claims have been canceled. Each of

the independent, new claims 41, 46 and 51 recites the step of generating executable code which is a tangible step and practical application. Therefore, new claims 41-55 recite statutory subject matter under 35 USC 101.

The Examiner also rejected claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-19, 21-25, 27-30 and 32-40 under 35 USC 103 based on System/390, Coutant, Benson and Breslau et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection as applied to the new claims 41-55, based on the following.

The Examiner stated "System/390 and Benson did not explicitly state selecting and determining at compile time" but asserted "Breslau demonstrated that it was known at the time of the invention to select a savearea and linkage service at compile time". The Examiner also stated "System/390 and Coutant did not explicitly state selecting and determining at compile time", but asserted "Breslau et al. demonstrated that it was known at the time of the invention to select a savearea and linkage service at compile time". Applicants disagree with the Examiner's characterization of Breslau et al. Breslau et al. disclose the creation of separate target versions of source code and translation of a call from one format to another format (See column 2 lines 5-21 and 43-59 and column 9 lines 2-20). However, Breslau et al. do not disclose management of different register lengths of calling and called programs as recited in claim 41. Breslau et al. do not even disclose different register lengths for a calling program and a called program.

Therefore, Breslau et al. cannot suggest or render obvious the foregoing feature of claim 41.

Claims 42-45 depend on claim 41, and therefore distinguish over the prior art for the same reasons that claim 41 distinguishes thereover.

Claims 46-50 and 51-55 distinguish over the prior art for the same reasons that claims 41-45 distinguish thereover.

Respectfully submitted,

Arthur Samodovitz

Reg. 31,297

Telephone (607) 429-4368 FAX (607) 429-4119